



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/075,867	02/13/2002	Joerg Peetz	DE 010043	9455
24737	7590	04/20/2005	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			MARTIN, NICHOLAS A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/075,867

Applicant(s)

PEETZ, JOERG

Examiner

Nicholas Martin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/6/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2154

1. Claims 1-4 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because on lines 4-5 it states, "...and file the bridge terminals are synchronized with only one sub-network...". This is a grammatical error as it is unclear as to what "file the bridge terminals" is referring to.
3. Claim 3 is objected to because of a typographical error on line 10 where 'characterized' is misspelled.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menon et al. (hereinafter Menon), US 2001/0022784, in view of Nitadori, Kazuhiko (hereinafter Nitadori), US 5,875,183.
5. As per claim 1, Menon teaches a network comprising a plurality of sub-networks which each include terminals and which exchange data with each other via at least one bridge terminal in which a controller for controlling a sub-network is provided for connecting at least one other bridge terminal for data transfer between at least two sub-

Art Unit: 2154

networks (Paragraphs [0051-0058], [0067], [0071], [0077] and [0346]) and file the terminals are synchronized with only one sub-network (Paragraphs [0108] and [0366]).

6. Menon does not teach a network comprising synchronizing the bridge terminals with only one sub-network during certain periods.

7. Nitadori teaches a network comprising synchronizing during certain periods (Col. 2, lines 38-51; Col. 11, lines 4-16).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Nitadori and Menon because both deal with communication of data between wireless terminals pertaining to individual sub-networks. Furthermore, the teaching of Nitadori to allow synchronizing during certain periods would improve the functionality of Menon's system by allowing only one sub-network to be updated/synchronized ensures that the proper load and traffic conditions are allocated per sub-network in order for synchronization to occur without errors.

9. As per claim 2, Menon teaches a network as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that a bridge terminal is synchronized with at least two sub-networks (Paragraphs [0051-0061], [0071] and [0366]).

10. Menon does not teach a network as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that synchronizing with at least two sub-networks over essentially the same period of time (Col. 2, lines 38-51; Col. 11, lines 4-16; Col. 15, lines 59-67; Col. 16, lines 1-7).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Nitadori and Menon because both deal with communication of data between wireless terminals pertaining to individual sub-

networks. Furthermore, the teaching of Nitadori to allow synchronizing with at least two sub-networks over essentially the same period of time would improve the functionality of Menon's system by allowing for two sub-networks to be updated/synchronized ensures that the data being transmitted is consistent between the two sub-networks and that the proper load and traffic conditions are allocated per sub-network in order for synchronizing with at least two sub-networks.

12. As per claim 3, Menon teaches a network as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that a bridge terminal functioning as a controller of the sub-network with which it is synchronized (Paragraphs [0051-0058], [0071] and [0366]).

13. Menon does not teach a network as claimed in claim1, characterized in that a terminal is provided for sending a message before the synchronization from one sub-network to another and sends a presence message to a terminal after synchronization.

14. Nitadori teaches a network as claimed in claim1, characterized in that a terminal is provided for sending a message before the synchronization from one sub-network to another and sends a presence message to a terminal after synchronization (Col. 2, lines 38-53; Col. 15, lines 59-67; Col. 16, lines 1-7, lines 49-56).

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Nitadori and Menon because both deal with communication of data between wireless terminals pertaining to individual sub-networks. Furthermore, the teaching of Nitadori to allow sending a message before the synchronization from one sub-network to another and sends a presence message to a terminal after synchronization would improve the functionality of Menon's system by

Art Unit: 2154

allowing the sub-networks to be synchronized utilizing the proper load and traffic conditions to ensure that the synchronization from one sub-networks occurred without any errors.

16. As per claim 4, Menon teaches a bridge terminal in a network comprising a plurality of sub-networks, each containing terminals, which, together with at least one other bridge terminal, is used for exchanging data between the sub-networks and is synchronized with only one sub-network (Paragraphs [0051-0058], [0067], [0071], [0077], [0108], [0346] and [0366]).

17. Menon does not teach a bridge terminal in a network comprising synchronizing the bridge terminals with only one sub-network during certain periods of time.

18. Nitadori teaches a network comprising synchronizing during certain periods of time (Col. 2, lines 38-51; Col. 11, lines 4-16).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Nitadori and Menon because both deal with communication of data between wireless terminals pertaining to individual sub-networks. Furthermore, the teaching of Nitadori to allow synchronizing during certain periods of time would improve the functionality of Menon's system by allowing only one sub-network to be updated/synchronized ensures that the proper load and traffic conditions are allocated per sub-network in order for synchronization to occur without errors.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further the show the state of the art with respect to "Network Comprising A Plurality Of Sub-Networks Which Can Be Linked Via Bridge Terminals".

- | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------------|
| i. | US 4,893,307 | McKay et al. |
| ii. | US 5,463,735 | Pascucci et al. |

21. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire in THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3970. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3970.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

nam
March 28, 2005


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISOR PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100